arXiv:1410.2399v1 [math.AP] 9 Oct 2014

On the interior regularity criteria of the 3-D Navier-Stokes equations involving two velocity components

Wendong Wang† Liqun Zhang‡ and Zhifei Zhang♯

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, P.R. China

E-mail: wendong@dlut.edu.cn

‡Institute of Mathematics, AMSS, Hua Loo-Keng Key Laboratory of Mathematics,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P.R. China

E-mail: lqzhang@math.ac.cn

♯School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, P.R. China

E-mail: zfzhang@math.pku.edu.cn

October 10, 2014

Abstract

We present some interior regularity criteria of the 3-D Navier-Stokes equations involving two components of the velocity. These results in particular imply that if the solution is singular at one point, then at least two components of the velocity have to blow up at the same point.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$(NS)\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + u\cdot\nabla u + \nabla\pi = 0, \\ \mathrm{div} u = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\big(u(x,t),\pi(x,t)\big)$ denote the velocity and the pressure of the fluid respectively.

In a seminal paper [11], Leray proved the global existence of weak solution with finite energy. In two spatial dimensions, Leray weak solution is unique and regular. In three spatial dimensions, the regularity and uniqueness of weak solution is an outstanding open problem in the mathematical fluid mechanics. It was known that if the weak solution u of (1) satisfies so called Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin(LPS) type condition

$$u\in L^q(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)) \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{2}{q}+\frac{3}{p}\le 1, \quad p\ge 3,$$

then it is regular in $\mathbb{R}^3\times(0,T)$, see [16, 6, 17, 5], where the regularity in the class $L^\infty(0,T;L^3(\mathbb{R}^3))$ was proved by Escauriaza, Seregin and Šverák [5].

Concerning the partial regularity of weak solution, it was started by Scheffer [15], and later Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [1] showed that one dimensional Hausdorff measure of

the possible singular set is zero. The proof relies on the following small energy regularity result: there exists some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that if u is a suitable weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations and satisfies

$$\sup_{R>0} \frac{1}{R} \int_{Q_R(z)} |\nabla u|^2 dxdt \le \varepsilon_0,$$

then u is regular at the point z (i.e., u is bounded in a $Q_r(z)$ for some $r > 0$). Here and in what follows $z = (x, t)$, $Q_R(z) = (-R^2 + t, t) \times B_R(x)$ and $B_R(x)$ is a ball of radius r centered at x. One could check [12, 10, 18, 7, 19] for the simplified proof and improvements.

Recently, there are many interesting works devoted to the LPS type criterions involving the partial components of the velocity, see [2, 3, 4, 9, 14] and references therein. The authors [20] considered the interior regularity criteria involving the partial components of the velocity. Let

$$G(u, p, q; r) \triangleq r^{1-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}} \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r)}.$$

It was proved in [20] that if (u, π) is a suitable weak solution of (1) in Q_1 and satisfies

$$\sup_{0<r<1} G(u_3, p, q; r) < M \quad \text{for some } M > 0, \tag{2}$$

and

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} G(u_h, p, q; r) = 0,$$

where $u_h = (u_1, u_2)$ and $1 \le \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} < 2$, $1 < q \le \infty$, then $(0, 0)$ is a regular point.

The goal of this paper is to get rid of the extra condition (2). Making full use of the structure of nonlinear term and div$u = 0$, we obtain the following interior regularity criteria involving two components of the velocity.

Theorem 1.1 *Let (u, π) be a suitable weak solution of (1) in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0)$. If u satisfies one of the following three conditions:*

1. $u_h \in L_t^q L_x^p(Q_{r_0})$, $\frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 1, 2 < q < \infty$;
2. $\nabla u_h \in L_t^q L_x^p(Q_{r_0})$, $\frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 2, 2 < q < \infty$;
3. $\nabla u_h \in L_t^q L_x^p(Q_{r_0})$ *and* $\limsup_{r\to 0} G(u_h, p, q; r) = 0, \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 2, 1 < q \le 2$;

for some $r_0 \in (0, 1)$, then u is regular at $(0, 0)$.

The range of (p, q) can be extended if we impose a similar condition on the velocity in a cylinder domain. The proof relies on a new pressure decomposition formula.

Theorem 1.2 *Let (u, π) be a suitable weak solution of (1) in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0)$. If u satisfies*

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} r^{1-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}} \Big(\int_{-r^2}^0 \big(\int_{\{x;|x_h|<r, x_3\in\mathbb{R}\}} |u_h(x,t)|^p dx_h dx_3 \big)^{\frac{q}{p}} dt \Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} = 0,$$

where (p, q) satisfies

$$1 \le \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \le 2, \quad \frac{3}{2} \le p \le \infty, \quad (p, q) \ne (\infty, 1),$$

then u is regular at $(0, 0)$.

Remark 1.3 *An interesting consequence of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 is that if the solution is singular at one point, then at least two components of the velocity have to blow up at the same point.*

2 Suitable weak solution and ε-regularity criterion

Let us first introduce the definition of suitable weak solution.

Definition 2.1 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $T > 0$. We say that (u, π) is a suitable weak solution of (1) in $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (-T, 0)$ if*

1. *$u \in L^\infty(-T, 0; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(-T, 0; H^1(\Omega))$ and $\pi \in L^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_T)$;*
2. *the (NS) equation is satisfied in the sense of distribution;*
3. *the local energy inequality: for any nonnegative $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R})$ vanishing in a neighborhood of the parabolic boundary of Ω_T,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2\phi dx + 2\int_{-T}^t \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \phi dx ds\\ &\le \int_{-T}^t \int_\Omega |u|^2(\partial_s\phi + \triangle\phi) + u\cdot\nabla\phi(|u|^2 + 2\pi)dxds\end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [-T, 0]$.

Let (u, π) be a solution of (1) and introduce the following scaling

$$u^\lambda(x,t) = \lambda u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \quad \pi^\lambda(x,t) = \lambda^2\pi(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), \tag{3}$$

for any $\lambda > 0$, then the family (u^λ, π^λ) is also a solution of (1). Let us introduce some invariant quantities under the scaling (3):

$$\begin{aligned}A(u, r, z_0) &= \sup_{-r^2+t_0\le t<t_0} r^{-1}\int_{B_r(x_0)} |u(y,t)|^2 dy,\\ E(u, r, z_0) &= r^{-1}\int_{Q_r(z_0)} |\nabla u(y,s)|^2 dyds.\end{aligned}$$

We also introduce

$$\begin{aligned}G(f, p, q; r, z_0) &= r^{1-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|f\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))},\\ H(f, p, q; r, z_0) &= r^{2-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|f\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))},\\ \widetilde{G}(f, p, q; r, z_0) &= r^{1-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|f - (f)_{B_r^2(x_0)}\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))},\\ \widetilde{H}(f, p, q; r, z_0) &= r^{2-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|f - (f)_{B_r^2(x_0)}\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))},\end{aligned}$$

where the mixed space-time norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))}$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\int_{t_0-r^2}^{t_0}\Big(\int_{B_r(x_0)} |f(x,t)|^p dx\Big)^{\frac{q}{p}} dt\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

and $(f)_{B_r(x_0)}$ is the average of f in the ball $B_r(x_0)$. These scaling invariant quantities will play an important role in the interior regularity theory.

For the simplicity, we denote $Q_r(0)$ by Q_r and $B_r(0)$ by B_r, and we will use the following notations:

$$A(u,r,(0,0)) = A(u,r), \quad E(u,r,(0,0)) = E(u,r).$$

Here and in what follows, we define a solution u to be regular at $z_0 = (x_0, t_0)$ if $u \in L^\infty(Q_r(z_0))$ for some $r > 0$. We recall the following ε-regularity result.

Proposition 2.2 *[7] Let (u, π) be a suitable weak solution of (1) in $Q_1(z_0)$ and $w = \nabla \times u$. There exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that if one of the following two conditions holds,*

1. $r^{1-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))} \le \varepsilon_1$ *for any* $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, *where* $1 \le \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \le 2$;

2. $r^{2-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|w\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r(z_0))} \le \varepsilon_1$ *for any* $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, *where* $2 \le \frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q} \le 3$ *and* $(p,q) \ne (1,\infty)$;

then u is regular at z_0.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Throughout this section, we assume that (u, π) is a suitable weak solution of (1) in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (-1, 0)$ and $u \in L^\infty(-1, 0; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(-1, 0; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

3.1 Proof of Case 1

In this subsection, we assume that $\nabla_h = (\partial_1, \partial_2)$ and $u_h = (u_1, u_2) \in L_t^q L_x^p(Q_{r_0})$ for some $r_0 \in (0, 1)$, where $\frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 1, 2 < q < \infty$. We denote by (p', q') the conjugate index of (p, q).

Lemma 3.1 *It holds that for any $r \in (0, 1)$,*

1. *if $\frac{3}{l} + \frac{2}{s} = \frac{3}{2}, 2 \le l \le 6$, we have*

$$\|u\|_{L_t^s L_x^l(Q_r)} \le C\big(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2(Q_r)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2(Q_r)}\big);$$

2. *if $\frac{3}{l} + \frac{2}{s} = 4, 1 \le l \le \frac{3}{2}$, we have*

$$\||u|\nabla u\|_{L_t^s L_x^l(Q_r)} \le C\big(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2(Q_r)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2(Q_r)}\big)^2.$$

Here C is a constant independent of r.

Proof. By scaling invariance, it suffices to consider the case of $r = 1$. By Hölder inequality and Sobolev interpolation inequality (for example, see [1]), we get

$$\|u\|_{L_t^s L_x^l(Q_1)} \le C\|u\|^{\frac{6-l}{2l}}_{L_t^\infty L_x^2(Q_1)}\|u\|^{\frac{3l-6}{2l}}_{L_t^s H_x^1(Q_1)} \le C\big(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2(Q_1)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2(Q_1)}\big).$$

This gives the first inequality. The proof of the second inequality is similar. □

In the following, we derive the local energy inequality. We denote

$$G_1(f,p,q;r) \triangleq r^{3-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}}\|f\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_r)}.$$

Lemma 3.2 *Let $0<4r<\rho<r_0$ and $1\le p,q\le\infty$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&A(u,r)+E(u,r)\\
&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 A(u,\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2 G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)+G_1(\nabla_h\pi,p',q';\rho)\big)\\
&\quad+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}\big(\tilde H(\pi_1,2,2;\rho)+\tilde H(\pi_3,2,2;\rho)\big)\\
&\quad+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}G_1\big(\partial_3\pi_4,\frac{2p}{p+2},\frac{2q}{q+2};\rho\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C is independent of r,ρ, and π_1,π_3 and $\partial_3\pi_4$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_1=\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\sum_{i+j<6}\partial_i\partial_j\big(u_iu_j\big)dy,\quad \pi_3=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\nabla_h\cdot(-u_3u_h)dy,\\
&\partial_3\pi_4=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\partial_3\big(u_h\cdot\nabla_h u_3\big)dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let ζ be a cutoff function, which vanishes outside of Q_ρ and equals 1 in $Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$, and satisfies

$$|\nabla\zeta|\le C\rho^{-1},\quad |\partial_t\zeta|+|\triangle\zeta|\le C\rho^{-2}.$$

Define the backward heat kernel as

$$\Gamma(x,t)=\frac{1}{4\pi(r^2-t)^{3/2}}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4(r^2-t)}}.$$

Let $\phi=\Gamma\zeta$. Due to the local energy inequality and noting that $(\partial_t+\triangle)\Gamma=0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_t\int_{B_\rho}|u|^2\phi dx+\int_{Q_\rho}|\nabla u|^2\phi dxdt\\
&\le\int_{Q_\rho}\big(|u|^2(\triangle\phi+\partial_t\phi)-\phi u\cdot\nabla(|u|^2+2\pi-2(\pi)_{B_\rho})\big)dxdt\\
&\le\int_{Q_\rho}\big(|u|^2(\Gamma\triangle\zeta+\Gamma\partial_t\zeta+2\nabla\Gamma\cdot\nabla\zeta)-\phi u\cdot\nabla(|u|^2)-\phi u\cdot\nabla(2\pi-2(\pi)_{B_\rho})\big)dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify the following facts:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma(x,t)\ge C^{-1}r^{-3}\quad\text{in } Q_r;\\
&\phi\le Cr^{-3},\quad |\nabla\phi|\le|\nabla\Gamma|\zeta+\Gamma|\nabla\zeta|\le Cr^{-4};\\
&|\Gamma\triangle\zeta|+|\Gamma\partial_t\zeta|+2|\nabla\Gamma\cdot\nabla\zeta|\le C\rho^{-5}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u\cdot\nabla(|u|^2)dxdt\triangleq I_1+I_2,$$

where

$$I_1 = \int_{Q_\rho} \phi u_h \cdot \nabla_h(|u|^2)dxdt, \quad I_2 = \int_{Q_\rho} \phi u_3 \cdot \nabla_3(|u|^2)dxdt.$$

By Hölder inequality and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq Cr^{-3}\|u_h\|_{L_t^q L_x^p(Q_\rho)}\|\nabla(|u|^2)\|_{L_t^{q'} L_x^{p'}(Q_\rho)} \\ &\leq Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big), \end{aligned}$$

and using the facts that $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ and $\frac{3}{2p'} + \frac{2}{2q'} = 2$, we get by integrating by parts and Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq \big|\int_{Q_\rho} \phi u_3 \partial_3(|u_h|^2)dxdt - 2\int_{Q_\rho} \phi u_3^2 \nabla_h \cdot u_h dxdt\big| \\ &\leq \big|\int_{Q_\rho} (\phi\partial_3 u_3 + u_3\partial_3\phi)(|u_h|^2)dxdt - 2\int_{Q_\rho} u_h \cdot \nabla_h(\phi u_3^2)dxdt\big| \\ &\leq Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)+r^{-1}\|u\|^2_{L_t^{2q'}L_x^{2p'}(Q_\rho)}\big) \\ &\leq Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2 G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big). \end{aligned}$$

This gives that

$$|I| \leq Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2 G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big).$$

The main trouble comes from the term including the pressure. Let

$$II = \int_{Q_\rho} \phi u \cdot \nabla(\pi - (\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt \triangleq II_1 + II_2,$$

where

$$II_1 = \int_{Q_\rho} \phi u_h \cdot \nabla_h(\pi - (\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt, \quad II_2 = \int_{Q_\rho} \phi u_3 \partial_3(\pi - (\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt.$$

We get by Hölder inequality that

$$|II_1| \leq C_0 r^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G(u_h,p,q;\rho)G_1(\nabla_h\pi,p',q';\rho).$$

To deal with II_2, recall that the pressure π satisfies

$$-\triangle\pi = \partial_i\partial_j(u_i u_j),$$

hence,

$$\pi = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x-y|}\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \partial_i\partial_j\big(u_i u_j\big)dy \triangleq \pi_1 + \pi_2,$$

where

$$\pi_1 = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\sum_{i+j<6}\partial_i\partial_j\big(u_iu_j\big)dy, \quad \pi_2 = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\partial_3\big(u_3u_3\big)dy.$$

We get by using $\nabla\cdot u = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\pi_2 dxdt &= \int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\Big[\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\partial_3\big(u_3u_3\big)dy\Big]dxdt\\
&= \int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\Big[\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\big(u_h\cdot\nabla_h u_3 - \nabla_h\cdot(u_3u_h)\big)dy\Big]dxdt\\
&= \int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\Big[\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\nabla_h\cdot(-u_3u_h)dy\Big]dxdt\\
&\quad + \int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\Big[\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|}\partial_3\partial_3\big(u_h\cdot\nabla_h u_3\big)dy\Big]dxdt\\
&\triangleq \int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\pi_3 dxdt + \int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\pi_4 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|II_2| &\le \Big|\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3(\pi_1+\pi_3)dxdt\Big| + \Big|\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3\pi_4 dxdt\Big|\\
&\le C\|\partial_3(\phi u_3)\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)}\big(\|\pi_1-(\pi_1)_{B_\rho}\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)} + \|\pi_3-(\pi_3)_{B_\rho}\|_{L^2(Q_\rho)}\big)\\
&\quad + Cr^{-3}\|u_3\|_{L_t^nL_x^m(Q_\rho)}\|\partial_3\pi_4\|_{L_t^{n'}L_x^{m'}(Q_\rho)},
\end{aligned}$$

where (m',n') is the conjugate index of (m,n) satisfying

$$\frac{1}{m'} = \frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{n'} = \frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{2},$$

hence, $m = \frac{2p}{p-2}$, $n = \frac{2q}{q-2}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
|II_2| &\le Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}\big(\tilde H(\pi_1,2,2;\rho)+\tilde H(\pi_3,2,2;\rho)\big)\\
&\quad + Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G(u,\frac{2p}{p-2},\frac{2q}{q-2};\rho)G_1(\partial_3\pi_4,\frac{2p}{p+2},\frac{2q}{q+2};\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\frac{3}{\frac{2p}{p-2}} + \frac{2}{\frac{2q}{q-2}} = \frac32$, we get by Lemma 3.1 that

$$G(u,\frac{2p}{p-2},\frac{2q}{q-2};\rho) \le C\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12},$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
|II_2| &\le Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}\big(\tilde H(\pi_1,2,2;\rho)+\tilde H(\pi_3,2,2;\rho)\big)\\
&\quad + Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}G_1(\partial_3\pi_4,\frac{2p}{p+2},\frac{2q}{q+2};\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Now the lemma follows by summing up the estimates of I, II_1 and II_2. □

The following lemma is devoted to the estimates of the pressure.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\pi_1, \pi_3, \partial_3\pi_4$ be as in Lemma 3.2. Then it holds that for $0 < 8r < \rho < r_0$,*

$$\tilde{H}(\pi_1, 2, 2; r) \le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} G(u_h, p, q; \rho)\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 \tilde{H}(\pi_1, 1, 2; \rho),$$

$$\tilde{H}(\pi_3, 2, 2; r) \le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} G(u_h, p, q; \rho)\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 \tilde{H}(\pi_3, 1, 2; \rho),$$

$$G_1(\nabla_h\pi, p', q'; r) \le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big) + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p'}-1} G_1(\nabla_h\pi, 1, q'; \rho),$$

$$G_1(\partial_3\pi_4, \frac{2p}{p+2}, \frac{2q}{q+2}; r) \le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big) G(u_h, p, q; \rho) E(u,\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{p+6}{2p}} G_1(\partial_3\pi_4, 1, \frac{2q}{q+2}; \rho),$$

where C is a constant independent of r, ρ.

Proof. Let ζ be a cut-off function,which equals 1 in $Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$ and vanishes outside of Q_ρ. We decompose π_1 into $\tilde{\pi}_1 + \tilde{\pi}_2$ with

$$\tilde{\pi}_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x-y|} \sum_{i+j<6} \partial_i\partial_j\big(u_i u_j \zeta^2\big).$$

By Calderon-Zygmund inequality, we have

$$\int_{B_\rho} |\tilde{\pi}_1|^2 dx \le C\int_{B_\rho} \big(|u_h||u|\big)^2 dx.$$

Since $\tilde{\pi}_2$ is harmonic in $Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r} |\tilde{\pi}_2 - (\tilde{\pi}_2)_{B_r}|^2 dx &\le C_0 r^5 \sup_{B_{\rho/4}} |\nabla\tilde{\pi}_2|^2 \\ &\le C\Big(\frac{r}{\rho}\Big)^5 \rho^{-3}\Big(\int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |\tilde{\pi}_2 - (\tilde{\pi}_2)_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}}| dx\Big)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Then we get by Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}(\pi_1, 2, 2; r) &\le Cr^{-\frac{1}{2}} \||u_h||u|\|_{L_t^2 L_x^2(Q_\rho)} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 \tilde{H}(\pi_1, 1, 2; \rho) \\ &\le Cr^{-\frac{1}{2}} G(u_h, p, q; \rho) \|u\|_{L_t^{\frac{2q}{q-2}} L_x^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(Q_\rho)} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 \tilde{H}(\pi_1, 1, 2; \rho) \\ &\le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} G(u_h, p, q; \rho)\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 \tilde{H}(\pi_1, 1, 2; \rho).\end{aligned}$$

The first equality of the lemma is proved. The proof of the second inequality is almost the same. Let us turn to the proof of the third inequality. Recall that π satisfies

$$-\triangle\pi = \partial_i\partial_j(u_i u_j).$$

We decompose $\nabla_h\pi$ into $\tilde{\pi}_1 + \tilde{\pi}_2$ with

$$\tilde{\pi}_1 = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x-y|} \partial_i\partial_j\big(\nabla_h(u_i u_j)\zeta^2\big) dx.$$

By Calderon-Zygmund inequality, we have

$$\int_{B_\rho} |\tilde{\pi}_1|^{p'} dx \le C \int_{B_\rho} \big(|u||\nabla_h u|\big)^{p'} dx.$$

Since $\nabla_h \tilde{\pi}_2$ is harmonic in $Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r} |\tilde{\pi}_2|^{p'} dx &\le Cr^3 \sup_{B_{\rho/4}} |\tilde{\pi}_2|^{p'} \\ &\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^3 \rho^{-3p'+3} \Big(\int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |\tilde{\pi}_2| dx \Big)^{p'}.\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\frac{3}{p'} + \frac{2}{q'} = 4$, we infer from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}&G_1(\nabla_h \pi, p', q'; r) \\ &\le G_1(\tilde{\pi}_1, p', q'; r) + G_1(\tilde{\pi}_2, p', q'; r) \\ &\le Cr^{-1} \|u \nabla_h u\|_{L_t^{q'} L_x^{p'}(Q_\rho)} + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p'}-1} G_1(\tilde{\pi}_2, 1, q'; \rho) \\ &\le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big) + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p'}-1} G_1(\nabla_h \pi, 1, q'; \rho).\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality is proved. The proof of the fourth inequality is similar. □

Lemma 3.4 *Let $\pi_1, \pi_3, \partial_3 \pi_4$ be as in Lemma 3.2. It holds that for any $r_0 \in (0,1)$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{H}(\pi_1, 1, 2; r_0) + \tilde{H}(\pi_3, 1, 2; r_0) \le C, \\ &G_1(\nabla_h \pi, 1, q'; r_0) + G_1(\partial_3 \pi_4, 1, \frac{2q}{q+2}; r_0) \le C,\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends on r_0 and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(-1,0;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(-1,0;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\|_{L_t^s L_x^l((-1,0)\times R^3)} \le C\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap L_t^2 H_x^1((-1,0)\times R^3)}, \quad \frac{3}{l} + \frac{2}{s} = \frac{3}{2}, \quad 2 \le l \le 6, \\ &\|u|\nabla u|\|_{L_t^s L_x^l((-1,0)\times R^3)} \le C\|u\|^2_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap L_t^2 H_x^1((-1,0)\times R^3)}, \quad \frac{3}{l} + \frac{2}{s} = 4, \quad 1 \le l \le \frac{3}{2},\end{aligned}$$

from which and Calderon-Zygmund inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(\pi_1, \pi_3)\|_{L_t^{\frac{s}{2}} L_x^{\frac{l}{2}}((-1,0)\times R^3)} \le C\|u\|^2_{L_t^s L_x^l((-1,0)\times R^3)}, \quad \frac{3}{l} + \frac{2}{s} = \frac{3}{2}, \quad 2 < l \le 6, \\ &\|(\nabla \pi, \partial_3 \pi_4)\|_{L_t^s L_x^l((-1,0)\times R^3)} \le C\|u|\nabla u|\|_{L_t^s L_x^l((-1,0)\times R^3)}, \quad \frac{3}{l} + \frac{2}{s} = 4, \quad 1 < l \le \frac{3}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows by taking suitable (s, l) and Hölder inequality. □

Now we are in position to prove Case 1 in Theorem 1.1. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\rho \in (0, r_0)$ so that

$$G(u_h, p, q; \rho) \le \varepsilon. \tag{4}$$

Take r so that $0 < 8r < \rho < r_0$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&A(u,r) + E(u,r)\\
&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 A(u,\rho) + C_0\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\varepsilon\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho) + G_1(\nabla_h\pi, p', q';\rho)\big)\\
&\quad + C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}\big(\tilde H(\pi_1,2,2;\rho) + \tilde H(\pi_3,2,2;\rho)\big)\\
&\quad + C\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12} G_1(\partial_3\pi_4, \frac{2p}{p+2}, \frac{2q}{q+2};\rho)\\
&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 A(u,\rho) + C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^4\big((\varepsilon+\delta)\big(A(u,\rho) + E(u,\rho)\big) + \varepsilon G_1(\nabla_h\pi, p', q';\rho)\big)\\
&\quad + C\delta^{-1}\big(\tilde H(\pi_1,2,2;\rho)^2 + \tilde H(\pi_3,2,2;\rho)^2 + G_1(\partial_3\pi_4, \frac{2p}{p+2}, \frac{2q}{q+2};\rho)^2\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta > 0$ will be determined later. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
F(r) \;=\;& A(u;r) + E(u;r) + \varepsilon^{\frac12} G_1(\nabla_h\pi, p', q'; r)\\
&+\delta^{-\frac32}\big(\tilde H(\pi_1,2,2;r)^2 + \tilde H(\pi_3,2,2;r)^2 + G_1(\partial_3\pi_4, \frac{2p}{p+2}, \frac{2q}{q+2};r)^2\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(r) \;\le\;& C\Big(\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 + (\varepsilon+\delta+\sqrt{\varepsilon})\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^4 + \sqrt{\delta}\Big)F(\rho)\\
&+C\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big) + \big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p'}-1}\Big)F(\rho)\\
&+C\Big(\delta^{-\frac32}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\varepsilon^2 + \big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^4 + \big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{1+\frac{6}{p}}\Big)F(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Take $r = \theta\rho$ with $0 < \theta < \frac18$. The above inequality yields that

$$F(\theta\rho) \le C\big(\theta^2 + \sqrt{\delta} + (\varepsilon+\delta+\sqrt{\varepsilon})\theta^{-4} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\theta^{-1} + \theta^{\frac{3}{p'}-1} + \delta^{-\frac32}\theta^{-2}\varepsilon^2 + \theta^{1+\frac{6}{p}}\big)F(\rho).$$

We first choose θ small enough, then choose δ small, and finally choose ε small enough so that

$$F(\theta\rho) \le \frac12 F(\rho).$$

On the other hand, Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 imply that

$$F(r_0) \le C$$

with C depending on r_0 and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(-1,0;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))\cap L^2(-1,0;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}$. Then a standard iteration argument ensures that there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$F(r) \le \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{for any} \quad 0 < r < r_1 < r_0,$$

which implies Case 1 of Theorem 1.1 by Proposition 2.2. □

3.2 Proof of Case 2 and Case 3

Let us claim that Case 2 and Case 3 in Theorem 1.1 can be deduced from the following theorem.

Theorem 3.5 *Let (u,π) be a suitable weak solution of (1) in $R^3\times(-1,0)$. If it satisfies*

$$\limsup_{r\to 0}\big(H(\nabla u_h,p,q;r)+G(u_h,p,q;r)\big)=0,\quad \frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=2,\quad 1<q<\infty, \tag{5}$$

then u is regular at $(0,0)$.

Indeed, the assumptions in Case 3 obviously imply (5). Let us verify (5) in Case 2. In such case, $2<q<\infty$ and $\frac{3}{2}<p<3$. By Poincáre inequality, we have

$$G(u_h-(u_h)_{B_r},p,q;r)\le CH(\nabla u_h,p,q;r)$$

for any $0<r<r_0$. Since $\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(u_h,p,q;r)\\
&\le G(u_h-(u_h)_{B_\rho},p,q;r)+G((u_h)_{B_\rho},p,q;r)\\
&\le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G(u_h-(u_h)_{B_\rho},p,q;\rho)+C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p}-1}G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\\
&\le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)H(\nabla u_h,p,q;\rho)+C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p}-1}G(u_h,p,q;\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $p<3$ and $\limsup_{r\to 0}H(\nabla u_h,p,q;r)=0$. Then by a standard iteration, there holds

$$\limsup_{r\to 0}G(u_h,p,q;r)=0,$$

which implies (5). □

In what follows, we assume that $\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=2, 1<q<\infty$. We denote by (p',q') the conjugate index of (p,q). To prove Theorem 3.5, we need the following local energy inequality.

Lemma 3.6 *Let $0<4r<\rho<r_0$. It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&A(u,r)+E(u,r)\\
&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2A(u,\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G_1(\partial_3\pi,\frac{2p}{p+1},\frac{2q}{q+1};\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\quad+C\big(\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)H(\nabla u_h,p,q;\rho)+\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)+\widetilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C is independent of r,ρ.

Proof. Since the proof is very similar to Lemma 3.2, we only present a sketch. Using the same test function ϕ in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_t\int_{B_\rho}|u|^2\phi dx+\int_{Q_\rho}|\nabla u|^2\phi dxdt\\
&\le\int_{Q_\rho}\big(|u|^2(\triangle\phi+\partial_t\phi)-\phi u\cdot\nabla(|u|^2+2\pi-2(\pi)_{B_\rho})\big)dxdt\\
&\le\int_{Q_\rho}\big(|u|^2(\Gamma\triangle\zeta+\Gamma\partial_t\zeta+2\nabla\Gamma\cdot\nabla\zeta)-\phi u\cdot\nabla(|u|^2)-\phi u\cdot\nabla(2\pi-2(\pi)_{B_\rho})\big)dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u\cdot\nabla(|u|^2)dxdt\triangleq I_1+I_2,$$

where

$$I_1=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_h\cdot\nabla_h(|u|^2)dxdt,\quad I_2=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\cdot\partial_3(|u|^2)dxdt.$$

By Hölder inequality and $\nabla\cdot u=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|I_1| &\le \big|\int_{Q_\rho}\phi\nabla_h\cdot u_h(|u|^2)dxdt\big|+\big|\int_{Q_\rho}(u_h\cdot\nabla_h\phi)(|u|^2)dxdt\big|\\ &\le Cr^{-2}\big((\frac{\rho}{r})H(\nabla u_h,p,q;\rho)+(\frac{\rho}{r})^2G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big)G(u,2p',2q';\rho)^2,\end{aligned}$$

and noting that $\partial_3|u|^2\le|\nabla u_h||u|$, we get

$$|I_2|\le Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)H(\nabla u_h,p,q;\rho)G(u,2p',2q';\rho)^2,$$

which along with Lemma 3.1 imply that

$$|I|\le Cr^{-2}\big((\frac{\rho}{r})H(\nabla u_h,p,q;\rho)+(\frac{\rho}{r})^2G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big).$$

Let

$$II=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u\cdot\nabla(\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt\triangleq II_1+II_2,$$

where

$$II_1=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_h\cdot\nabla_h(\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt,\quad II_2=\int_{Q_\rho}\phi u_3\partial_3(\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt.$$

We have by Hölder inequality and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}|II_1| &\le \big|\int_{Q_\rho}\phi\nabla_h\cdot u_h((\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt\big|+\big|\int_{Q_\rho}(u_h\cdot\nabla_h\phi)(\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho})dxdt\big|\\ &\le Cr^{-2}\big((\frac{\rho}{r})H(\nabla u_h,p,q;\rho)+(\frac{\rho}{r})^2G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big)\widetilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho),\\ |II_2| &\le Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G_1(\partial_3\pi,\frac{2p}{p+1},\frac{2q}{q+1};\rho)G(u,2p',2q';\rho)\\ &\le Cr^{-2}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)G_1(\partial_3\pi,\frac{2p}{p+1},\frac{2q}{q+1};\rho)\big(A(u,\rho)+E(u,\rho)\big)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows by summing up the estimates of I, II_1 and II_2. □

The proof of the following lemma is similar to Lemma 3.3. So, we omit the details.

Lemma 3.7 *It holds that for any* $0 < 8r < \rho < r_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; r) &\le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)\tilde{G}(u, 2p', 2q'; \rho)^2 + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p'}}\tilde{H}(\pi, 1, q'; \rho),\\
G_1(\partial_3\pi, \frac{2p}{p+1}, \frac{2q}{q+1}; r) &\le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{G}(u, 2p', 2q'; \rho)H(\nabla u_h, p, q; \rho)\\
&\quad + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{1+\frac{3}{2p}}G_1(\partial_3\pi, 1, \frac{2q}{q+1}; \rho),
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C *is independent of* r, ρ.

Now let us turn to prove Theorem 3.5. By the assumption, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\rho \in (0, r_0)$ so that

$$H(\nabla u_h, p, q; \rho) + G(u_h, p, q; \rho) \le \varepsilon.$$

Take $r > 0$ so that $0 < 8r < \rho < r_0$. It follows from Lemma 3.6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
A(u, r) + E(u, r) \;&\le\; C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 A(u, \rho) + C\delta^{-1}G_1(\partial_3\pi, \frac{2p}{p+1}, \frac{2q}{q+1}; \rho)^2\\
&\quad + C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\big((\varepsilon + \delta)(A(u, \rho) + E(u, \rho)) + \varepsilon\widetilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; \rho)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta > 0$ will be determined later. Let

$$F(r) = A(u, b; r) + E(u, b; r) + \varepsilon^{1/2}\tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; r) + \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}G_1(\partial_3\pi, \frac{2p}{p+1}, \frac{2q}{q+1}; r)^2.$$

Then it follows from Lemma 3.7 that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(r) \;&\le\; C\Big(\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^2 + \sqrt{\delta} + (\varepsilon + \delta + \sqrt{\varepsilon})\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\Big)F(\rho)\\
&\quad + C\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big) + \big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{3}{p'}}\Big)F(\rho) + C\Big(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)\varepsilon^2 + \big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{2+\frac{3}{p}}\Big)F(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Take $r = \theta\rho$ with $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{8}$. The above inequality yields that

$$F(\theta\rho) \le C\big(\theta^2 + \sqrt{\delta} + (\varepsilon + \delta + \sqrt{\varepsilon})\theta^{-2} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\theta^{-1} + \theta^{\frac{3}{p'}} + \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}\theta^{-1}\varepsilon^2 + \theta^{2+\frac{3}{p}}\big)F(\rho).$$

We first choose θ small enough, then choose δ small, finally choose ε small enough so that

$$F(\theta\rho) \le \frac{1}{2}F(\rho).$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$F(r_0) \le C$$

with C depending on r_0 and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(-1,0;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))\cap L^2(-1,0;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}$. Then a standard iteration argument ensures that there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$F(r) \le \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < r < r_1 < r_0.$$

which implies Theorem 3.5 by Proposition 2.2. □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Throughout this section, we assume that (u,π) be a suitable weak solution of (1) in $\mathbb{R}^3\times(-1,0)$. Let us first introduce some notations.

Let $B_r^2=\big\{(x_1,x_2);|(x_1,x_2)|\le r\big\}$, $B_r^*=B_r^2\times R=\big\{(x_1,x_2,x_3);(x_1,x_2)\in B_r^2,x_3\in R\big\}$, and $Q_r^*=B_r^*\times(-r^2,0)$. Moreover, $Q_r^*(z_0)=(-r^2+t_0,t_0)\times B_r^*(x_0)$, $B_r^*(x_0)=B_r^2(x_0)\times R$ and $B_r^2(x_0)$ is a ball of radius r centered at the horizontal part of x_0. For the simplicity, we denote $Q_r^*(0)$ by Q_r^* and $B_r^*(0)$ by B_r^*. As in Section 2, we will still use the notations like $A(u,r),E(u,r)$, $G(f,p,q;r)$, $H(f,p,q;r)$, $\widetilde{G}(f,p,q;r)$, $\widetilde{H}(\pi,p,q;r)$ etc. The differences are that here the integral domain is replaced by Q_r^* or B_r^*, and the mean value in $\widetilde{G},\widetilde{H}$ is taken only on B_r^2. We denote by (p',q') the conjugate index of (p,q).

Lemma 4.1 *Let $0<4r<\rho<r_0$ and $1\le p,q\le\infty$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}&A(u;r)+E(u;r)\\&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)A(u;\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\Big(G(u,2p',2q';\rho)^2+\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho)\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant independent of r,ρ.

Proof. Let ζ be a cutoff function, which vanishes outside of Q_ρ^* and equals 1 in $Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}^*$, and satisfies

$$|\nabla\zeta|\le C_0\rho^{-1},\quad |\partial_t\zeta|+|\triangle\zeta|\le C_0\rho^{-2}.$$

Define the backward heat kernel as

$$\Gamma(x,t)=\frac{1}{4\pi(r^2-t)}e^{-\frac{|x_h|^2}{4(r^2-t)}}.$$

Taking the test function $\phi=\Gamma\zeta$ in the local energy inequality, and noting $(\partial_t+\triangle_h)\Gamma=0$, where $\triangle_h=\partial_{x_1}^2+\partial_{x_2}^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_t\int_{B_\rho^*}|u|^2\phi dx+\int_{Q_\rho^*}|\nabla u|^2\phi dxdt\\&\le\int_{Q_\rho^*}\big[|u|^2(\triangle\phi+\partial_t\phi)+u\cdot\nabla\phi(|u|^2+2\pi-2(\pi)_{B_\rho^2})\big]dxdt\\&\le\int_{Q_\rho^*}\big[|u|^2(\Gamma\triangle\zeta+\Gamma\partial_t\zeta+2\nabla\Gamma\cdot\nabla\zeta)+|\nabla\phi||u_h|(|u|^2+2|\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho^2}|)\big]dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Gamma(x,t)\ge C_0^{-1}r^{-2}\quad\text{in } Q_r^*,\\&|\nabla\phi|\le|\nabla\Gamma|\zeta+\Gamma|\nabla\zeta|\le C_0r^{-3},\\&|\Gamma\triangle\zeta|+|\Gamma\partial_t\zeta|+2|\nabla\Gamma\cdot\nabla\zeta|\le C_0\rho^{-4},\end{aligned}$$

from which and Hölder inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&A(u,r)+E(u,r)\\&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)A(u,\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\rho^{-2}\int_{Q_\rho^*}(|u_h||u|^2+|u_h||\pi-(\pi)_{B_\rho^2}|)dxdt\\&\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)A(u,\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2G(u_h,p,q;\rho)\big(G(u,2p',2q';\rho)^2+\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho)\big).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

In the sequel, we assume that (p, q) satisfies

$$\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=2, \quad \frac{3}{2}\le p<\infty.$$

Lemma 4.2 *For any $0<r<r_0$, we have*

$$G(u,2p',2q';r)^2 \le C\big(E(u,2r)+A(u,2r)\big),$$

where C is a constant independent of r.

Proof. Recall a well-known Sobolev's interpolation inequality (for example, see [1]):

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|f|^\ell \le C\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla f|^2dx\Big)^a\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|f|^2dx\Big)^{\frac{\ell}{2}-a}, \tag{6}$$

where $2\le\ell\le 6$ and $a=\frac{3}{4}(\ell-2)$. Applying (6) with $\ell=2p'$ (Note that $2p'\le 6$ since $p\ge\frac{3}{2}$) and a suitable localization, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(u,2p',2q';r)^2 = r^{\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}-3}\|u\|^2_{L^{2p',2q'}(Q_r^*)}\\
&\le Cr^{-1}\Big\{\int_{-r^2}^0\big[\Big(\int_{B_{2r}^*}|\nabla u|^2\Big)^a\Big(\int_{B_{2r}^*}|u|^2\Big)^{p'-a}+r^{-2a}\Big(\int_{B_{2r}^*}|u|^2\Big)^{p'}\big]^{\frac{q'}{p'}}dt\Big\}^{\frac{1}{q'}}\\
&\le Cr^{-1}\Big\{\int_{-r^2}^0\Big(\int_{B_{2r}^*}|\nabla u|^2\Big)^{\frac{aq'}{p'}}\Big(\int_{B_{2r}^*}|u|^2\Big)^{q'(1-\frac{a}{p'})}dt+r^{-\frac{2aq'}{p'}+2}\Big(\sup_t\int_{B_{2r}^*}|u|^2\Big)^{q'}\Big\}^{\frac{1}{q'}},
\end{aligned}$$

then the lemma follows by noting that $\frac{aq'}{p'}=1$ and $-\frac{2a}{p'}+\frac{2}{q'}=-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}+2=0$. □

In the following, we will introduce a new pressure decomposition formula in a cylinder domain based on the following properties of harmonic function, which is new even for harmonic function to our knowledge.

Lemma 4.3 *Let f be a harmonic function in a cubic $D_1\subset\mathbb{R}^3$. Let*

$$\begin{aligned}
P_3f(x_h)&=\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^1 f(x_1,x_2,x_3)dx_3,\\
P_hf(x_3)&=\frac{1}{4}\int_{-1}^1\int_{-1}^1 f(x_1,x_2,x_3)dx_h.
\end{aligned}$$

Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x\in B_{\frac{1}{2}}}|\nabla_3 f|&\le C\int_{B_1}|f(x)-P_3f(x_h)|dx,\\
\sup_{x\in B_{\frac{1}{2}}}|\nabla_h f|&\le C\int_{B_1}|f(x)-P_hf(x_3)|dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $|h| \le \frac{1}{5}$, let

$$f^h(x) = f^h(x_1, x_2, x_3) = f(x_1, x_2, x_3 + h),$$

and $g(x) = f(x) - P_3 f(x_1, x_2)$. It is easy to see that

$$f(x) - f^h(x) = g(x) - g^h(x), \quad x \in B_{\frac{4}{5}}.$$

Since f is a harmonic function in D_1, we have

$$\triangle\big(f(x) - f^h(x)\big) = \triangle\big(g(x) - g^h(x)\big) = 0, \quad x \in B_{\frac{4}{5}}.$$

The gradient estimate of harmonic function yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\partial_3 f - \partial_3 f^h| \le C \sup_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}} |f - f^h| \le C \sup_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}} |g - g^h|,\\
&\sup_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}} |g - g^h| \le C \int_{B_{\frac{4}{5}}} |g - g^h| dx \le C \int_{B_1} |f - P_3 f| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that for any $|h| \le \frac{1}{5}$,

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} |\partial_3 f - \partial_3 f^h| \le C \sup_{B_{\frac{3}{4}}} |f - f^h| \le C \int_{B_1} |f - P_3 f| dx. \tag{7}$$

The second inequality of (7) implies by Mean value theorem that given $x \in B_{1/2}$, there exists $h = h(x)$ with $|h| \le \frac{1}{5}$ so that

$$|\partial_3 f(x_1, x_2, x_3 + h)| \le C \int_{B_1} |f - P_3 f| dx,$$

which along with (7) gives the first inequality of the lemma. The proof of the second inequality of the lemma is similar. □

Let

$$\tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; r) = r^{2 - \frac{3}{p'} - \frac{2}{q'}} \Big(\int_{-r^2}^0 \big(\int_{B_r^*} |\pi - P_{h,r}\pi(x_3)|^{p'} dx_h dx_3 \big)^{\frac{q'}{p'}} dt \Big)^{1/q'},$$

where

$$P_{h,r}\pi(x_3) = \frac{1}{|B_r^2|} \int_{B_r^2} \pi(x_h, x_3) dx_h.$$

Lemma 4.4 *For any $0 < 8r < \rho < r_0$, it holds that*

$$\tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; r) \le C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big) \tilde{G}(u, 2p', 2q'; \rho)^2 + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}} \tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; \rho),$$

where C is a constant independent of r, ρ.

Proof. Recall that the pressure π satisfies

$$\triangle\pi = -\partial_i\partial_j(u_iu_j).$$

Let $\pi = \pi_1 + \pi_2$ where π_1 is defined by

$$\triangle\pi_1 = -\partial_i\partial_j(u_iu_j\chi(x_h)),$$

here $\chi(x_h)$ is a smooth function with $\chi(x_h) = 1$ for $|x_h| \le \frac{\rho}{2}$ and $\chi(x_h) = 0$ for $|x_h| \ge \rho$. So, π_2 is harmonic in $B^*_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$.

Due to $p' > 1$, by Calderon-Zygmund inequality we have

$$\tilde{H}(\pi_1, p', q'; \rho) \le C\tilde{G}(u, 2p', 2q'; \rho)^2. \tag{8}$$

We denote $B^*_{\rho,k} = B^2_\rho \times (-k\rho, k\rho)$. Since π_2 is harmonic in $B^*_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$, we have

$$\int_{B^*_{r,k}} |\pi_2 - (\pi_2)_{B^2_r}|^{p'} dx \le Cr^{3+p'} \sum_{j=1}^{2k} \sup_{B_{\sqrt{2}r}(z_j)} |\nabla_h\pi_2|^{p'},$$

where $z_j \in \big\{x; x_h = 0, x_3 = \ell r + \frac{1}{2}r - kr, 0 \le \ell < 2k\big\}$. We infer from Lemma 4.3 that

$$\sup_{B_{\sqrt{2}r}(z_j)} |\nabla_h\pi_2|^{p'} \le C\rho^{-3-p'} \int_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(z_j)} |\pi_2 - P_{h,\frac{\rho}{2}}\pi_2|^{p'} dx.$$

Note that the ball $B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(z_j)$ intersects each other at most $C\frac{\rho}{r}$ times. We infer that

$$\int_{B^*_{r,k}} |\pi_2 - (\pi_2)_{B^2_r}|^{p'} dx \quad \le \quad C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{2+p'} \int_{B^*_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |\pi_2 - P_{h,\frac{\rho}{2}}\pi_2|^{p'} dx,$$

and letting $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\tilde{H}(\pi_2, p', q'; r) \le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{3-\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{2}{q'}} \tilde{H}(\pi_2, p', q'; \rho).$$

which along with (8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; r) &\le \tilde{H}(\pi_1, p', q'; r) + \tilde{H}(\pi_2, p', q'; r) \\ &\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{2-\frac{3}{p'}-\frac{2}{q'}} \tilde{G}(u, b, 2p', 2q'; \rho)^2 + C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)^{3-\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{2}{q'}} \tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; \rho). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished. □

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 1.2. Let

$$F(r) = A(u, r) + E(u, r) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{H}(\pi, p', q'; r).$$

Take (r, ρ, κ) so that $0 < 8r < \rho$ and $8\rho < \kappa < r_0$ and

$$G(u_h, p, q; \rho) \le \varepsilon.$$

It suffices to consider the case

$$\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}=2,\quad \frac{3}{2}\le p\le\infty,\quad (p,q)\neq(\infty,1),$$

since the other cases can be reduced to such case by Hölder inequality.

We know from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.4 that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho) &\le C\big(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}\big)\tilde{G}(u,b,2p',2q';\kappa)^2+C\big(\frac{\rho}{\kappa}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\kappa)\\ &\le C\big(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}\big)F(\kappa)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{\kappa}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\kappa),\end{aligned}$$

which along with Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.4 gives

$$\begin{aligned}F(r) &\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)A(u,\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\big(\varepsilon G(b,2p',2q';\rho)^2+\varepsilon\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho)\big)\\ &\quad+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';r)\\ &\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)F(\rho)+C\varepsilon\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2F(\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\varepsilon\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\rho)+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';r)\\ &\le C\big(\frac{r}{\rho}\big)F(\rho)+C_0\varepsilon\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2F(\rho)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\varepsilon\big(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}\big)F(\kappa)+C\big(\frac{\rho}{r}\big)^2\varepsilon\big(\frac{\rho}{\kappa}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\kappa)\\ &\quad+C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\big(\frac{\kappa}{r}\big)F(\kappa)+C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\big(\frac{r}{\kappa}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}}\tilde{H}(\pi,p',q';\kappa)\\ &\le C\big((\frac{r}{\rho})(\frac{\kappa}{\rho})+(\frac{\rho}{r})^2\varepsilon(\frac{\kappa}{\rho})+(\frac{\rho}{r})^2\varepsilon^{\frac12}\big(\frac{\rho}{\kappa}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}(\frac{\kappa}{r})+\big(\frac{r}{\kappa}\big)^{\frac{2}{p'}}\big)F(\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Take $r=\theta^2\rho$, $\rho=\theta\kappa$ with $0<\theta<\frac18$. The above inequality yields that

$$F(r)\le C\big(\theta+\varepsilon\theta^{-5}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\theta^{-4+\frac{2}{p'}}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\theta^{-3}+\theta^{\frac{6}{p'}}\big)F(\kappa).$$

Choose θ small enough, and then choose ε small enough so that

$$C\big(\theta+\varepsilon\theta^{-5}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\theta^{-4+\frac{2}{p'}}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}\theta^{-3}+\theta^{\frac{6}{p'}}\big)\le\frac12.$$

This gives the following iterative inequality

$$F(\theta^2\kappa)\le\frac12F(\kappa).$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$F(R)\le C$$

with C depending on R and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(-1,0;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))\cap L^2(-1,0;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}$. Indeed, since π satisfies

$$-\triangle\pi=\partial_i\partial_j(u_iu_j),$$

by Calderon-Zygmund inequality and interpolation inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi\|_{L^{q'}(-T,0;L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^3))} &\le C_0\|u\|^2_{L^{2q'}(-T,0;L^{2p'}(\mathbb{R}^3))}\\ &\le C_0\|u\|^2_{L^\infty(-T,0;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))\cap L^2(-T,0;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}.\end{aligned}$$

Then a standard iteration argument ensures that there exists $r_1>0$ such that

$$F(r)\le\varepsilon\quad\text{for all}\quad 0<r<r_1.$$

which implies Theorem 1.2 by Proposition 2.2. □

Acknowledgments. W. Wang was supported by NSFC 11301048. L. Zhang was partially supported by the innovation program at CAS and National Basic Research Program of China under grant 2011CB808002. Z. Zhang was partially supported by NSF of China under Grant 11071007, Program for New Century Excellent Talents.

References

[1] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn and L. Nirenberg, *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 35(1982), 771-831.

[2] C. Cao and E. S. Titi, *Regularity criteria for the three dimensional Navier-Stokes equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 57 (2008), 2643-2662.

[3] C. Cao and E. S. Titi, *Global regularity criterion of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations involving one entry of the velocity gradient tensor*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 202(2011), 919-932.

[4] J. Y. Chemin and P. Zhang, *On the critical one component regularity for 3-D Navier-Stokes system*, arXiv:1310.6442.

[5] L. Escauriaza, G. A. Seregin and V. Šverák, $L^{3,\infty}$ *solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness*, Russ. Math. Surveys, 58(2003), 211-250.

[6] Y. Giga, *Solutions for semilinear parabolic equations in* L^p *and regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes system*, J. Differential Equations, 62(1986), 186-212.

[7] S. Gustafson, K. Kang and T.-P. Tsai, *Interior regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations,* Comm. Math. Phys., 273(2007), 161-176.

[8] I. Kukavica, *On partial regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 21 (2008), 717-728.

[9] I. Kukavica and M. Ziane, *One component regularity for the Navier-Stokes equation*, Nonlinearity, 19 (2006), 453-469.

[10] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya and G. A. Seregin, *On partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech., 1(1999), 356-387.

[11] J. Leray, *Sur le mouvement d'un liquids visqeux emplissant l'espace*, Acta Math., 63(1934), 193-248.

[12] F. H. Lin, *A new proof of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg theorem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 51(1998), 241-257.

[13] J. Nečas, M. Růžička and V. Šverák, *On Leray's self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Acta Math., 176(1996), 283-294.

[14] M. Pokorný and Y. Zhou, *On the regularity of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations via one velocity component*, Nonlinearity, 23 (2010), 1097-1107.

[15] V. Scheffer, *Partial regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations,* Pacific J. Math., 66 (1976), 535-552.

[16] J. Serrin, *The initial value problem for the Navier-stokes equations*, in Nonlinear problems(R. E. Langer Ed.), pp.69-98, Univ. of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1963.

[17] M. Struwe, *On partial regularity results for the Navier-Stokes equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 41(1988), 437-458.

[18] G. Tian and Z. Xin, *Gradient estimation on Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Anal. Geom., 7(1999), 221-257.

[19] A. Vasseur, *A new proof of partial regularity of solutions to Navier-Stokes equations*, Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., 14(2007), 753-785.

[20] W. Wang and Z. Zhang, *On the interior regularity criterion and the number of singular points to the Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Anal. Math., 123(2014), 139–170.